



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/725,233

12/01/2003

Irene Quenville

P03346

2124

23702 7590 06/12/2007
Bausch & Lomb Incorporated
One Bausch & Lomb Place
Rochester, NY 14604-2701

EXAMINER

DELCOTTO, GREGORY R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1751

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/12/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/725,233	Applicant(s) QUENVILLE ET AL.	
	Examiner Gregory R. Del Cotto	Art Unit 1751	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on RCE filed 3/30/07.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 8-17 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-17 are pending. Applicant's arguments and amendments filed 3/30/07 have been entered.

Claims 8-17 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 8/10/05.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 3/30/07 has been entered.

Objections/Rejections Withdrawn

The following objections/rejections as set forth in the Office action mailed 5/30/06 have been withdrawn:

The rejection of claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention, has been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 1751

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Asgharian et al (US 6,228,323) in view of Huth (US 6,165,954) or Heiler et al (US 6,323,165).

Asgharian et al teach a two-compartment bottle assembly useful in preparing multi-purpose compositions containing an Al-trypsin and disinfectant. These compositions are useful for cleaning and disinfecting contact lenses. See Abstract. The bottle may be made out of materials such as molded polyethylene, polyethyleneterphlatate (PET), etc. See column 5, lines 1-5. The disinfecting

Art Unit: 1751

compositions generally contain one or more antimicrobial agents, a buffer, tonicity agents, a chelating agent, and surfactants (i.e. block copolymers). See column 11, lines 50-69. Specifically, Asgharian et al contain cleaning compositions containing 0.001% Polyquaternium 1, 0.6% boric acid, 0.1% sodium chloride, 0.05% Tetronic 1304, 0.05 disodium edetate, water, etc. See column 14, lines 25-45.

Asgharian et al do not teach the use of an Alexidine antimicrobial agent or an article of manufacture comprising a container formed from polyethyleneterephthalate and a composition containing surfactants, an Alexidine antimicrobial agent, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific amounts as recited by the instant claims.

Heiler et al teach compositions which may be used in the multipurpose cleaning solutions for contact lenses and can eliminate the need for special enzyme cleaners. See Abstract. The compositions may contain one or more antimicrobial agents such as chlorhexidine, salts of alexidine, alexidine free bases, etc. See column 7, lines 20-60.

Huth teaches enzyme compositions and methods employing enzyme compositions which are useful for cleaning contact lenses. See Abstract. Suitable antimicrobial agents include alexidine, alexidine-free base, salts of chlorhexidine, etc. See column 12, lines 7-25.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use an antimicrobial agent such as Alexidine in the composition taught by Asgharian et al, with a reasonable expectation of success, because Heiler et al or Huth teach the use of Alexidine antimicrobial agents in a similar contact lens

Art Unit: 1751

cleaning composition and further, Asgharian et al teach the use of antimicrobial agents in general.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, for formulate an article of manufacture comprising a container formed from polyethyleneterephthalate and a composition containing surfactants, an Alexidine antimicrobial agent, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific amounts as recited by the instant claims, with a reasonable expectation of success and similar results with respect to other disclosed components, because the broad teachings of Asgharian et al in combination with Huth or Heiler et al suggest an article of manufacture comprising a container formed from polyethyleneterephthalate and a composition containing surfactants, an Alexidine antimicrobial agent, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific amounts as recited by the instant claims.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Groemminger (US 2002/0115578) in view of Asgharian et al (US 6,228,323), Huth (US 6,165,954) and Heiler et al (US 6,323,165).

'578 teaches an aqueous composition for cleaning and wetting a contact lens containing a non-amine polyethyleneoxy-containing material having an HLB value of at least about 18, a first non-ionic surface active agent having cleaning activity for contact lens deposits that comprises a poloxamine, a second non-ionic surface active agent, and wetting agent. See Abstract. The cleaning compositions also include buffering agents such as sodium carbonate. Also, the compositions may contain antimicrobial

Art Unit: 1751

agents in amounts from 0.00001 to about 5% by weight. See para. 23-26. The compositions may also contain a sequestering agent such as EDTA.

Groemminger does not teach the use of a polyethyleneterephthalate container, Alexidine antimicrobial agent, or an article of manufacture comprising a container formed from polyethyleneterephthalate and a composition containing surfactants, an Alexidine antimicrobial agent, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific amounts as recited by the instant claims.

Asgharian et al, Huth, and Heiler et al are relied upon as set forth above.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to package the compositions taught by Groemminger in a polyethyleneterephthalate container, at the time the invention was made, because Asgharian et al teaches the use of a polyethyleneterephthalate container to package similar contact lens cleaning/disinfecting compositions.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use an antimicrobial agent such as Alexidine in the composition taught by Groemminger, with a reasonable expectation of success, because Heiler et al or Huth teach the use of Alexidine antimicrobial agents in a similar contact lens cleaning composition and further, Groemminger teaches the use of antimicrobial agents in general.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, for formulate an article of manufacture comprising a container formed from polyethyleneterephthalate and a composition containing surfactants, an

Art Unit: 1751

Alexidine antimicrobial agent, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific amounts as recited by the instant claims, with a reasonable expectation of success and similar results with respect to other disclosed components, because the broad teachings of Groemminger in combination with Asgharian et al, Heiler et al and Huth suggest an article of manufacture comprising a container formed from polyethyleneterephthalate and a composition containing surfactants, an Alexidine antimicrobial agent, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific amounts as recited by the instant claims.

Response to Arguments

With respect to the prior art rejections set forth above under 35 USC 103(a), Applicant states that even if the Examiner has established a prima facie case of obviousness, the prima facie case can be rebutted by the showing of unexpected and superior results presented in the instant specification. With respect to the data provided in the specification, Applicant once again states that the specification indicates that PET bottles containing a formulation of a polyether surfactant and alexidine, which have been stored for a period of time, provide greater antimicrobial efficacy than the same formulation in high density polyethylene bottles as demonstrated in Figure 4 of the specification. Note that, the Examiner asserts that the references and combination of references as set forth above are sufficient to render the claimed invention obvious under 35 USC 103(a). Further, the Examiner asserts that the comparative data presented in the specification is not sufficient to show the unexpected and superior properties of the claimed invention and overcome any prima facie case of obviousness.

Art Unit: 1751

First, in Table 5 which is graphically displayed in Figure 4, data is completely missing for all of the 8 month results for solutions comprising alexidine in PET bottles and thus, it is not clear if solutions comprising alexidine in PET bottles have unexpected and superior antimicrobial efficacy compared to the same solutions in HDPE bottles after 8 months. The Examiner once again asserts that an accurate determination as to whether the data shows unexpected and superior results cannot be made based on the incompleteness of the data. The fact that Applicant submitted all available data does not remedy the fact that the data is incomplete.

Furthermore, as stated previously, the data is not commensurate in scope with the claimed invention in that the instant claims are open to any proportion of Alexidine antimicrobial agent while the data in the specification shows only one starting amount of Alexidine in ppm which is used to produce the data shown in Figure 4. Furthermore, the claims are open to any type and amount of surfactant while the data in the specification provides data with respect to only several specific surfactant materials in very limited amounts which is not commensurate in scope with the claimed invention.

Conclusion

2. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Remaining references cited but not relied upon are considered to be cumulative to or less pertinent than those relied upon or discussed above.


Applicant is reminded that any evidence to be presented in accordance with 37 CFR 1.131 or 1.132 should be submitted before final rejection in order to be considered timely.

Art Unit: 1751

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory R. Del Cotto whose telephone number is (571) 272-1312. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. thru Fri. from 8:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Douglas McGinty can be reached on (571) 272-1029. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Gregory R. Del Cotto
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1751

GRD
June 5, 2007